

Attendance of the February 15, 2006 GMTF Meeting  
(based on sign-in sheet)

Name	Agency
Adams, Hon. Steve	City of Riverside
Afsharian, Gita	Wilbur Smith Associates
Baldwin, Hon. Harry	City of San Gabriel
Bok, Susan	LADOT
Bone, Lou	City of Tustin
Capelle, Joanne	SCRRA
Catz, Sarah	UC Irvine
Chankin, Deborah	Gateway Cities COG
Dale, Hon. Lawrence	City of Barstow
Daniels, Hon. Gene	City of Paramount
Flickinger, Hon. Bonnie	City of Moreno Valley
Ganguli, Pom Pom	SCAQMD
Garcia, Hon. Lee Ann	City of Grand Terrace
Goodwin, Art	ACTA
Gurule, Hon. Frank	City of Cudahy
Herrera, Hon. Carol	City of Diamond Bar
Hicks, Gill	Gill V. Hicks and Associates
Johnson, Leanne	City of Riverside
Kane, Maureen	CARB
Kwan, Patricia	SCAQMD
Kumar, Vin	Caltrans District 7
Lai, Sue	POLA
Logan, Angelo	East Yard Communitites for Environmental Justice
Lopez, Rosa	IVAG
Marquez, Jesse	Coalition for a Safe Environment
Neely, Sharon	ACE Construction Authority
Park, Noel	San Pedro Homeowners Coalition`
Roberts, Hon. Frank	City of Lancaster
Saunders, Christine	Port of Los Angeles
Schoetzow, Eileen	LAWA
Smith, Steve	SANBAG
Szerlip, Hon. Don	City of Redondo Beach
Travis, Mary	VCTC
Valdez, Lupe	Union Pacific Railroad
Wanda, Kathleen	Caltrans District 7
Warren, Elizabeth	LA Chamber of Commerce



SCAG Staff

---

Alcock, Joe  
Nadler, Jonathan  
Pfeffer, Nancy  
Wong, Philbert

---



## **GOODS MOVEMENT TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2006**

### **1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

Goods Movement Task Force Vice-Chair Gene Daniels, City of Paramount, called the meeting to order. A list of those in attendance is included in the minutes. Self introductions were made.

### **2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no comments.

### **3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

#### **3.1 Approval Items**

##### **3.1.1 Approval of the January 15, 2006 Minutes**

Motion to approve the January 15, 2006 Goods Movement Task Force minutes was seconded and accepted with no objections.

### **4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS**

#### **4.1 Overview of the Development of the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan**

Mr. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, presented this item. There are four reasons why SCAG produces the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). First, federal and state laws require that SCAG produce a regional transportation plan. Second, projects receiving federal funding must be included in the RTP. Third, NEPA clearances on regionally significant projects are contingent on its inclusion in the RTP. Fourth, an RTP is needed to maintain good stewardship of our transportation system and environment.

The RTP includes all modes of transportation, including roadways, public transportation, goods movement, aviation and airport ground access, and non-motorized transportation. It also examines system



preservation and demand management. The law states that the RTP must contain a policy, action (plan), and a financial element, and should also include a needs assessment and reference to environmental and air quality documents. Also, the RTP must look ahead at least 20 years, and the 2008 RTP will plan to the year 2035. The RTP must also use the most current tools and data, be developed through a collaborative process, and be updated every four years.

In terms of regulatory compliance, the RTP must comply with CEQA regulations, meet transportation conformity requirements, environmental justice mandates, and fiscal constraint tests.

A number of other planning documents and programs will provide input into the 2008 RTP. These include SCAG's growth visioning implementation, the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the RTP Program EIR, the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), State Implementation Plan (SIP), and planning efforts by the County Transportation Commissions, such as OCTA's Long Range Transportation Plan.

As a result of the recently adopted Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), SCAG is now required to update the RTP every four years, whereas previously the RTP was updated every three years. SAFETEA-LU also expanded the RTP planning requirements to include addressing environmental mitigation, transportation system security, greater emphasis on land use/transportation connection, and a greater emphasis on non-motorized transportation.

The preliminary schedule is to adopt the new RTP in April 2008. The draft would be released for public review and comment 3 to 5 months before adoption, and final input would be needed 2 to 4 months before draft release. This would mean that input on the goods movement component of the RTP would be needed by summer 2007. However, Mr. Amatya noted that there are some ambiguous elements of SAFETEA-LU that may require SCAG to update the RTP on a three-year cycle, which would result in a 2007 RTP instead of 2008 RTP. SCAG is currently working with federal representatives to address this issue.

Mr. Jesse Marquez, Coalition for a Safe Environment, asked what the appropriate forum would be to study innovative technologies to move freight, such as the Maglev Task Force. Mr. Amatya

responded that the appropriate forum would be the Plans and Programs Technical Advisory Committee.

Ms. Sharon Neely, ACE Construction Authority, asked how the 'Environmental mitigation plan for goods movement in Southern California' RFP would fit into the 2008 RTP. Ms. Pfeffer responded that this work is scheduled to be completed in June 2007 and would then be incorporated into the EIR for the 2008 RTP.

Hon. Lee Ann Garcia, City of Grand Terrace, asked why there is not more time between release of the draft RTP and adoption of the final RTP to review and provide input into the document. Mr. Rich Macias, SCAG, responded that because of ambiguous regulations in SAFETEA-LU, it is not clear whether SCAG will need to proceed with a three or four year RTP update. While SCAG would like to use the four year update, it is working to resolve this issue. This is the reason an approximate RTP schedule is provided rather than a more specific one. Hon. Garcia also asked what committee would be studying the non-motorized portion of the plan, and Mr. Amatya responded that the Plans and Programs TAC would be.

#### 4.2 Overview of Major State Proposals: SB-1024 and Governor's Bond Proposal

Mr. Jeff Dunn, SCAG, presented this item. He spoke on the two bond proposals proposed by Governor Schwarzenegger and Senator Perata, the legislative process, and SCAG's adopted priorities as they relate to the bond proposal.

SB 1024, also known as the Safe Facilities, Improved Mobility, Disaster Preparedness and Clean Air Bond Act was introduced by Senator Perata and is a \$10.275 billion infrastructure bond proposal that would provide funds for transportation (\$6.8 billion), infill development/regional planning (\$1.65 billion), clean air/safety (\$600 million), and water quality/flood control (\$1.2 billion).

The Governor's bond proposal was introduced on January 10, 2006 as SB 1165 by Senator Dutton and AB 1838 by Assemblymember Oropesa. If approved by the State Legislature, a \$6 billion general obligation bond proposal would be put before the voters in both the 2006 and 2008 elections for a total of \$12 billion for transportation projects. Furthermore, a \$14 billion revenue bond proposal would be put before the voters in the 2012 election to finance transportation programs. This particular bond would be paid for by pledging 25% of fuel excise taxes and truck weight fees.

A conference committee has been appointed to work out the final proposal based on Senator Perata and the Governor's bond proposals. This committee is scheduled to work out a final proposal by March, which would then require a 2/3 vote of the Legislature. If the Legislature approves the proposal it would go to the voters in either June or November 2006. The conference committee is comprised of six members: Assemblymembers Judy Chu, John Laird, and Rick Keene, and Senators Wes Chesbro, Kevin Murray, and Dennis Hollingsworth.

Mr. Dunn also distributed a matrix comparing SCAG's adopted priorities to the transportation state infrastructure bond proposals. SCAG is working to ensure that goods movement related funds are based on volume of freight movement and not on population.

Ms. Neely raised the concern that in the Governor's bond proposal local cities would need to provide 80% of a project's cost to receive a 20% match from the state. She suggested adding language in the matrix that would seek to change the match requirement to 20% local funds to obtain an 80% state match for community mitigation-related projects.

Mr. Don Rhodes, SCAG, noted that the SCAG adopted policies were previously adopted by the policy committees and the Regional Council. The suggested actions listed on the right hand column in the matrix are the result of two policy workshops in January to receive input from the policy committees.

Mr. Marquez noted that the matrix should include a 'Cons' column and noted that environmental mitigation would probably cost significantly more than the \$1 billion allocated in the bond proposals.

Hon. Don Szerlip, City of Redondo Beach, asked for a more detailed explanation of design-sequencing and what design sequencing projects are currently underway. Per later clarification from Kathleen Wanda, Caltrans District 7, "Design-build means a procurement process in which both the design and construction of a project are procured from a single entity." "Design-sequencing is a method of contracting that enables the sequencing of design activities to permit each construction phase to commence when design for that phase is completed, instead of requiring design for the entire project to be completed before commencing construction." Current examples of design-build include the SR-22

widening and HOV lane project and the construction of HOV lanes on the I-405 from Route 10 to Route 101.

Mr. Marquez requested time to provide comments on the matrix. Mr. Dunn set the deadline to provide comments to SCAG as a week from date of the GMTF meeting (comments due February 22).

#### 4.3 Update on a Federal-State-Local Memorandum of Understanding on goods movement

Ms. Nancy Pfeffer, SCAG, presented this item. The origin of this MOU was a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) conference held in spring 2005 at UC Irvine that looked at improving NEPA using the example of goods movement. Through followup meetings subsequent to the conference, it was proposed to draft an MOU to express the intent of federal, state, and local agencies to collaborate in addressing goods movement challenges. This MOU is currently in draft form and would be non-binding. SCAG is working to seek additional input on the MOU and is in the process of setting up meetings with the Governor's office, the Business Transportation and Housing agency, and California Environmental Protection Agency.

Ms. Neely asked for clarification on the list of priority transportation projects referenced in Section II D. Ms. Pfeffer responded that the priority transportation projects would be based on existing lists, such as the list found in the 'Southern California Regional Strategy for Goods Movement' document.

Mr. Pom Pom Ganguli, AQMD, provided comments on the MOU, such as the need for public input, the need for a specific goal or product from the MOU, the need to respect local decision making authority, and the need to protect public health. Ms. Pfeffer noted that potential institutional arrangements related to the funding of goods movement projects and mitigation measures are currently being discussed by the CEOs of the county transportation commissions. She also agreed on the need to better clarify the goals and products of the MOU.

Ms. Mary Travis, VCTC, noted the need to include the Port of Hueneme in the MOU. Ms. Christine Saunders, Port of Los Angeles, suggested a cover memo be attached to the MOU to provide background and context as well as references to data sources used in the MOU.

## **5.0    STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Pfeffer provided the staff report. She reported on the following items:

- A Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) workshop is being offered on March 7 at SCAG Los Angeles office and March 8 at the SCAG Riverside Office.
- The first meeting of the Inland Port Feasibility Study TAC was held on January 26 at SCAG. The next meeting will probably be held in April.
- The FY 06-07 OWP will include a project to study innovative technologies for freight movement.

## **6.0    COMMENT PERIOD**

Mr. Angelo Logan and Mr. Noel Park requested a goods movement presentation from Mr. John Haveman of the Public Policy Institute to the GMTF.

## **7.0    NEXT MEETING**

The next regular GMTF meeting will be:  
Wednesday, March 15, 2006  
9:00am-11:00am  
SCAG Offices, San Bernardino Conference Rooms A&B

## **8.0    ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11 am